

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International File No. PCT/EP2004/053487

---

Re Point V

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 5,680,048 A (WOLLNY ET AL) October 21, 1997  
D2: US 5,307,272 A (BUTLER ET AL) April 26, 1994  
D3: WO 03/034094 A (UNIREC CO., LTD; YAMAGISHI, JUNICHI)  
April 24, 2003

2 Independent Claims 1 and 10

2.1 The present Application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the object of Claim 1 is not novel as defined by Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses refer to this document) a hand-held radar device (Figure 1, reference number 100) for determining the location of objects enclosed in a medium (col. 1, lines 47 through 51), including a radar sensor (col. 5, lines 27 through 28), which generates a first, high-frequency detection signal for penetrating a medium to be tested (col. 5, lines 29 through 31) in such a way that information about an object enclosed in the medium can be obtained by measuring and evaluating the reflected detection signal of the radar sensor (col. 5, lines 21 through 25), an additional sensor being provided for generating an additional detection signal for obtaining information about the object enclosed in the medium (col. 5, lines 59 through 63). The object of Claim 1 is therefore not novel.

Document D2 also discloses all features of Claim 1 (see D2, col. 4, lines 3 through 68). It must be pointed out that the expression "in particular a hand-held short-range radar" in Claim 1 does not limit the scope of protection of Claim 1 (see PCT Guidelines 5.40). The object of Claim 1 is therefore not novel in regard to document D2.

2.2 Method Claim 10 corresponds to Device Claim 1 and is also not novel for the reasons mentioned under point 2.1.

### **3 Dependent Claims 2 through 9 and 11 through 17**

3.1 Dependent Claims 2, 5 through 9 and 12 through 17 do not include any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of PCT regarding novelty (Art. 33(1), (2) PCT) and inventive step (Art. 33(1), (3) PCT):

Claims 2, 12, 16: See D1, col. 5, line 59.

Claims 3, 16: Capacitive sensors are well known (see D3, Abstract) and it would be obvious to use such a sensor, for example, in the mine finder of document D2 (see D2, col. 14, line 62 through col. 15, line 7).

Claims 5, 6, 16: See D2, col. 15, line 1.

Claims 7, 8: See D1, Figure 3 and col. 5, line 64 through col. 6, line 4.

Claim 9: See D1, col. 5, lines 29 through 31.

Claims 13 - 15: See D2, col. 4, lines 60 through 64.

Claim 17: Implicitly disclosed in D1 and D2: Accuracy is improved due to data fusion in both documents.

3.2 The present Application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because Claim 11 is not clear. The expression "in particular a capacitive sensor" in Claim 11 does not limit the scope of protection of Claim 11 (see PCT Guidelines 5.40), resulting in lack of clarity about the kind of sensor described in Claim 11.